

FRANK DEFENSE
MAY

TRY TO MAKE
DORSEY

TAKE WITNESS
STAND

Attorneys Are
Informed the

Solicitor Saw Frank
on Day

of Murder and
Thought He
Acted Queerly

AT THAT TIME CRIME
HAD NOT BECOME
KNOWN

Lawyers Will Contend
Circum-

stance Prejudiced His
Mind

When Murder Came to
Light

and Frank Was Accused

That Solicitor General Hugh M. Dorsey on April 2, 1913, saw Leo M. Frank, the man he was prosecuted once that day, on the street and at that time became suspicious of his actions, is information which has been placed in the hands of the attorneys for the defense.

Solicitor Dorsey is at present in Valdosta with his family, but The Journal communicated with him over long-distance telephone and he refused either to affirm or to deny the report.

An unusual fact in connection with the new sensation is that Solicitor Dorsey, although he never figured as a witness, claims to have heard the shot that he contended Mrs. Daisy Grace fired into her husband's spine. Next to the Frank case the Grace case was the most celebrated prosecution in which Mr. Dorsey has figured as solicitor.

According to the information placed in the hands of the defense, Solicitor Dorsey attended a meeting at the McClure wholesale house on the Saturday Mary Phagan was murdered. The meeting commenced at noon and lasted quite a while.

Mr. Dorsey, who is vice president of the McClure company, left the meeting with C. W. McClure some time after 2 o'clock, and started for a motion picture show.

SAYS HE SAW FRANK.

The Frank defense will contend, it is said, that the solicitor general then saw Leo M. Frank on the streets, probably about Hunter and Whitehall Sts., and some action on the part of the man who was later to go under the solicitor's fire, then aroused Mr. Dorsey's suspicions. The solicitor was so suspicious, it is alleged, that he later called Mr. McClure over the telephone to ask

him if he, too, did not think Frank acted queerly. This, however, is denied by Mr. McClure.

The latter, who is the head of the McClure's stores, was communicated with by a Journal reporter. Mr. McClure remembers the meeting on April 26 and remembers walking up town to a motion picture show with the solicitor.

Mr. McClure states that he is of the opinion that he and Mr. Dorsey left the store about 3 o'clock in the afternoon, but it is not certain of the time.

Then, Mr. McClure states, he did not know Leo Frank, even by sight, and does not have any recollection of seeking him. He did see the Montague brothers, directors of the pencil factory, on the walk to the "movie" with the solicitor he says.

Mr. Dorsey, over long-distance telephone, positively refused to discuss the case.

He was asked if he would make an affidavit as to what he saw Frank do on the street if requested to do so by the defense, and to that he replied: "I can't cross bridges until I get to them."

Although counsel for Frank, Luther Z. Rosser and Reuben R. Arnold, refuse to discuss the matter, it is generally considered probable that they will attempt to put the solicitor on oath, and secure the admission that he saw Frank and that Frank, on the day of the tragedy, aroused his suspicions.

IN KEEPING WITH CHARGE.

This would be in keeping with the charge that the defense will make in the extraordinary motion for a new trial that Mr. Dorsey became convinced of the guilt of the defendant before many of the facts in the case became known, and that he discarded all testimony that did not fit in with his theory of the murder.

The defense is expected to charge that the solicitor's knowledge that Frank was on the street at that time accounts for his discarding the testimony of Mrs. J. B. Simmons, of Bir-

(Continued on Page Two, Column 1.)

PDF PAGE 2, COLUMN 1

DORSEY SAW FRANK ON DAY OF CRIME, AND MAY BE A WITNESS

(Continued from Page 1.)

mingham, who swears she heard screams at the factory between 2 and 3 o'clock on the day of the tragedy.

When informed that the solicitor is said to have seen him on the day of the tragedy, Leo Frank declared that if Mr. Dorsey did see him, he could think of no action on his part which could have aroused anybody's suspicion.

“When I was on Whitehall, near Hunter Street,” Frank says, “I had two things on my mind. One was to walk by Jacobs’ Pharmacy and buy some cigars and the other was to get to the factory. I did both things, but do not remember turning suddenly after I had started in one direction or any other action like that which might be construed as suspicious. I might have been jostled in the crowd, however.”

At that time Frank says he did not know the solicitor general by sight.

Another of the various affidavits in the hands of the defense, which bear on Jim Conley and his actions about the factory before the date of the tragedy has been made public.

Miss Ruby Snipes, a seventeen-year-old employee of the factory, who resides at the corner of Hemphill Avenue and Curran Street, is the affiant, and she asserts under oath that Conley, in the dusk of an evening in April, 1911, met her at the point the defense claims he met Mary Phagan, and demanded a quarter.

Miss Snipes asserts that the negro startled her as he stepped from the dark place where he says he waited and watched on April 26, and that pointing to her purse he asked her in a surly manner for money.

She asked why he expected to get a quarter from her, she says, and then she heard a footstep at the top of the stairs and Conley retreated.

Before he left the city Friday, Solicitor Dorsey was in conference with Chief Newport Lanford and the various detectives who worked on the Frank case, and with William M. Smith, Jim Conley’s attorney.

After the conferences, E. A. Stephens, assistant attorney general, was sent out of the city on a mysterious mission.

Although Dorsey and the men under him remain silent, it is known that they are carefully preparing to fight every point the defense will make in its extraordinary motion.

Frank Asks How Lanford Knows When Conley Lies

Leo M. Frank, from his cell in the tower, replied Saturday morning to a published statement attributed to Chief of Detectives Newport Lanford in which the official is quoted as saying that he would not believe any new statement that William J. Burns or anyone else might get out of the negro Jim Conley at this time.

In this connection Frank said:

“When first arrested, Conley denied that he could write. Chief Lanford now admits that he lied on this point. On May 18 Conley made an affidavit, which the chief now says is a lie. On May 24 Conley made another statement, which is an admitted lie. On May 28 he made another affidavit which the detectives admit contained many lies. On May 29 he made still another statement, which the detectives admit contains quite a few lies.”

“After that, under the tender tutelage of the detectives, Conley evolved another statement which he told on the stand, and is vouched for by the state as the whole truth and nothing but the truth.”

“Lanford says he knows this is the truth. Now he is quoted as saying that any new statement the negro may make will be a lie.”

"The question is, How does he know?"

PDF PAGE 3, COLUMN 1

THE JOURNAL'S EDITORIAL GIVEN WIDE INDORSEMENT

Hundreds Commend
Editorial

"Frank Should Have a
New Trial"

Below The Journal prints a few more of the many hundreds of letters received by it, in which the paper and its editor are commended for the editorial, "Frank Should Have a New Trial," published Tuesday, March 10.

These letters come from Dr. A. R. Holderby, pastor of Moore Memorial Presbyterian church; Rev. Fred A. Line, pastor of the First Universalist church; Rev. Clement C. Cary, a retired

Methodist minister of Atlanta; George Gordon, Atlanta lawyer; J. D. Cloudman, southern agent in Atlanta for the Draper company; W. W. Daniel, cashier Union Central Life Insurance company, Atlanta.

FROM DR. HOLDERBY.

Atlanta, Ga., March 13, 1914.

Hon. J. R. Gray, Editor Atlanta Journal.

My Dear Sir: Permit to congratulate you upon the position your paper has taken in the case of Leo M. Frank.

Your splendid editorial was sane, conservative and convincing, and I trust it will be instrumental in securing for this unfortunate young man a fair and dispassionate trial.

You may call to mind that this was my position from the first and for which I was condemned.

I am not affirming, neither do you, that Frank is innocent or guilty, but simply that he has not had a fair and unprejudiced, trial.

If Frank is guilty, he should suffer the full penalty of the law.

But in the name of God let us give the fellow a fair chance to prove his innocence, if he is innocent, and thus save the state of Georgia from "blood-guiltiness."

I shall have more to say on this subject Sunday from my pulpit.

Cordially yours,

A. R. HOLDERBY.

FROM REV. F. A. LINE.

Atlanta, Ga., March 13, 1914.

Editor Atlanta Journal,

Dear Sir: I desire to concur with others in expressing most hearty commendation of your stand with reference of the Leo M. Frank case, as outlined in your editorial of Tuesday last. Your plea, made not in behalf of individuals but in behalf of principles, deserves the thoughtful consideration of all truth-loving justice seeking men and women. Your conviction, so forcibly and courageously expressed, that Mr. Frank has not had a fair trial—could not have a fair trial—could not have a fair trial under the conditions prevailing at the time—is the conviction of an ever0increasing number. This fact in itself should be sufficient for the fair-minded people of Atlanta and vicinity.

As suggested in your editorial, with the possibility of judicial murder, staring us as a community in the face, it is well indeed to pause and question ourselves as to what justice and fair dealing require in this case. Irrespective of personal conclusions as to the innocence or guilt of the party in question, we should be constantly reminded of the fact that in this great free democracy every man is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty; and whatever will assist in bringing to light the facts in the case to the satisfaction of all should be welcomed by those who believe in Mr. Frank's innocence and those who believe in his guilt. I am sure that the people as a whole are insistent that the guilty man shall be punished; moreover, that the innocent shall not be offered as a sacrifice for the guilty. They demand, or should demand exact justice.

It is refreshing and gratifying to find the press fulfilling its highest mission in standing for a square deal for every man, espousing the cause of truth and justice, at whatever cost.

I desire to add my word to yours in the plea for a new trial for Leo M. Frank.

Yours truly,

FRED A. LINE,

Pastor First, Universalist Church.

FROM REV. C. C. CARY.

March 13, 1914.

James R. Gray, Editor Journal,
Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Permit me to unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly approve your recent editorial, calling for a new trial for Leo M. Frank.

You have done right, and it was a brave act on your part thus to take this public position.

Of course, you will be criticized by many unreasonable and prejudiced people, but you can afford to stand firm with the inward consciousness of being right.

To hang Frank on the evidence of a self-confessed degraded negro perjurer would be nothing short of a legal calamity.

Yours truly,
CLEMENT C. CARY.

FROM ATTORNEY GEO. GORDON.

March 11, 1914

Hon. James R. Gray,
Editor The Atlanta Journal.

Dear Mr. Gray:

I take this opportunity to express to you my hearty approval and commendation of your timely and courageous editorial of March 10, upon the Frank case. It seems to me to have stated the case exactly as it is and should meet the approval of every fair-minded man. I think, too, that it expresses the honest conviction of a multitude of your fellow citizens with regard to this case and they owe you a debt of gratitude for the masterly way in which

you have spoken from the house top the sentiments they have held too secretly.

If Frank is guilty, a fair and legal trial will develop that fact. If he is not guilty, no one with a particle of manhood in his makeup could desire to have him punished.

I have no connection with this case and write you simply as your fellow citizen, interested with you in the reputation of your community, to indorse the stand you have taken in behalf of the fair name of Georgia and in defense of justice.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE GORDON.

FROM J. D. CLOUDMAN.

Atlanta, Ga., March 12, 1914.

Hon. James R. Gray,

Editor Atlanta Journal,

Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Sir: As a citizen of Atlanta interested in its welfare, permit me to congratulate you upon the brave and manly attitude of The Journal in reference to the Frank case, as set forth in your editorial Tuesday.

The stand of The Journal should meet with the outspoken approbation of all men who believe in justice and the due and proper administration of the laws.

I am, very truly yours,

J. D.

CLOUDMAN,

Southern

Agent.

FROM W. W. DANIEL.

Atlanta, Ga., March 11, 1914

Mr. James R. Gray,

Editor Atlanta Journal,

Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Sir: Pardon the liberty I take in addressing you, but I want to express to you my approval and thanks for the stand you have taken in the Frank matter. I, too, feel that the man is entitled to a new trial, and I am happy to see your editorial expression.

Very truly yours,

W. W. DANIEL.
